Case 1:17-cr-00165-PKC Document 37 Filed 01/22/18 Page 1 of 56 1

HCK81HOS	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
v.	17 Cr. 165 (PKC)
JUAN THOMPSON,	
Defendant.	
x	
	December 20, 2017 11:00 a.m.
Before:	
HON. P. KEV	IN CASTEL,
	District Judge
APPEAR	ANCES
JOON H. KIM Acting United States Attorn Southern District of New Yo JACOB E. WARREN JESSICA R. LONERGAN	rk
Assistant United States Att	orneys
FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK Attorneys for Defendant MARK B. GOMBINER	
JULLIAN D. HARRIS	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 (Case called)

> THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your name for the record.

MR. WARREN: Good morning, your Honor. Jacob Warren and Jessica Lonergan for the United States.

THE COURT: Good morning.

For the defendant.

MR. GOMBINER: Mark Gombiner and Jullian Harris, Federal Defenders, for Mr. Thompson. Good morning, Judge.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Thompson.

Good morning, Mr. Gombiner and Ms. Harris.

The first order of business is I am going to go through the materials I have, and the question, Mr. Gombiner, will be whether I have everything I should have. It will be the same question for the government.

So I have a presentence report, recommendation and addendum, prepared by probation and revised on September 1, 2017. I have a letter from the government, dated December 13, I have ten victim impact statements submitted by the 2017. government on or about November 2, 2017. I have a memorandum submitted by federal defenders, Mr. Gombiner and Ms. Harris, dated December 8, 2017. That is what I have on the substance of sentencing.

> Do I have everything I should have, Mr. Gombiner? MR. GOMBINER: Yes, Judge.

the plea agreement that the parties agreed to disagree on,

25

which was whether the guideline enhancement for violating a court order of protection applies.

THE COURT: And your position is that order must be served, and the government's position is that it need not be served but the defendant must know of its issuance.

MR. GOMBINER: Judge, my position is that under New York law you have to have actual notice before you can be guilty of violating a court order of protection. I think the law in New York is pretty clear that actual notice is not an e-mail that you can construe or infer that the defendant may or may not have, if there is some idea that there was some generic order of protection. Actual notice under New York law -- generally, people get notice of a court order of protection because they are served with it. But New York courts have also found that you could have notice if you are in court when the order was issued, or there was one case where the defendant was served in Vermont with a facsimile copy of the order of protection and that wasn't service as defined under New York law, but they had actual notice of it.

There is no case in New York, and the government hasn't cited any, even remotely suggesting that the kind of evidence the government is relying on, which is one e-mail in which -- first, the government says it was sent by Mr.

Thompson. The e-mail itself is not signed by him or anything. But even assuming he did send it, the kind of reference to,

there is some kind of aggravated order of protection, you go back to New York you would be arrested for violating it, it doesn't even say order of protection in the thing, but that is not what the New York courts mean by actual notice. That's not even constructive notice, which is a different kind of notice and a lesser form. New York courts require actual notice, and there have been cases that have been dismissed on that basis where there wasn't actual notice.

I would also point out that Mr. Thompson was in fact interviewed by a New York City detective on November 22, 2016, which was after --

THE COURT: What date?

MR. GOMBINER: November 22, which was after both the initial order of protection and the renewed order of protection had been issued, and that detective didn't tell Mr. Thompson anything about there being any order of protection against him.

THE COURT: So what? He is investigating a crime. Why would it be his job to say, And, sir, I want you to know there is an order of protection against you.

MR. GOMBINER: Because one of the things he said was, I don't want you contacting Ms. Rossi. That would seem to be an appropriate circumstance under which you would say there is an order of protection against you. I am not saying that's dispositive, but it's further evidence that Mr. Thompson did not have actual notice, as defined by New York law, of this

order of protection, and therefore this enhancement should not be applied.

THE COURT: Let me hear from the government.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, I think on at least one point, we are in agreement on the law in New York, which is that for an order of protection actual notice is what matters, and actual notice is what is required. I don't think there is any dispute that if there was actual notice the underlying conduct would violate the order.

This is the reason we carved this issue out for your Honor to decide in the plea agreement. The government put its best foot forward on these two pieces of evidence so as to demonstrate actual notice, conceding that proper service of process was not made here.

Those two pieces of evidence that show actual notice are an e-mail from Mr. Thompson where he says in the e-mail aggravated harassment. He sent other e-mails like this, basically making himself out to be the victim, and he seems to acknowledge in the e-mail that there is this order of protection in New York state, and he also makes the comment about not traveling to New York.

The second piece of evidence is what we just discussed, the interview with the New York City Police Department detective, where Mr. Thompson told the detective that they had filed harassment claims against each other.

Those are the two factual points that the government has to 1 demonstrate actual notice here, your Honor. 2 3 Again, I think on the law -- if there was actual 4 notice, I don't think that the defense and the government are 5 disputing that the order of protection would be violated. 6 THE COURT: Mr. Gombiner, would the defendant like a 7 Fatico hearing on this issue? 8 MR. GOMBINER: Judge, if it's going to affect the 9 Court's sentence -- let me just consult with my colleague. 10 THE COURT: Yes. 11 MR. GOMBINER: Judge, unless we are confident, which I 12 am not sure how we could be, that this wouldn't affect the 13 Court's sentence in any way, we would like a hearing on it. 14 THE COURT: OK. 15 Government can proceed, if you'd like. Do you want me to set another date for this? What's your pleasure? 16 17 MR. WARREN: Your Honor, we would rest on the underlying documents. In a hearing we can proceed. 18 19 wouldn't call any witnesses. 20 THE COURT: Do you have the documents? 21 MR. WARREN: Yes, your Honor. They are exhibits. 22 It's Exhibit B to the government's sentencing submission. 23 THE COURT: Mr. Gombiner, you have seen Exhibit B? 24 MR. GOMBINER: Exhibit B? Just one second, Judge.

Yes, I have seen all of these things. I am just

25

1	trying to locate them.	
2	THE COURT: Take your time.	
3	MR. WARREN: Just for the record, I have handed up	
4	Exhibits B and C to the government's sentencing submission.	
5	THE COURT: I now see Exhibit C has been handed up.	
6	MR. WARREN: The underlying e-mail that I was just	
7	speaking about, if I could just have a minute to find that	
8	document, your Honor.	
9	THE COURT: Yes.	
10	MR. WARREN: I am also handing up Exhibit E to the	
11	Court, which is the e-mail that I mentioned.	
12	THE COURT: All right. Any objection to these three	
13	exhibits, Mr. Gombiner?	
14	MR. GOMBINER: No. We don't have any objection to	
15	their authenticity.	
16	THE COURT: So they are received.	
17	(Government's Exhibits B, C & E received in evidence)	
18	THE COURT: Anything further from the government?	
19	MR. WARREN: Nothing further from the government on	
20	this point.	
21	THE COURT: Mr. Gombiner, do you have any evidence you	
22	want to offer?	
23	MR. GOMBINER: We don't have any evidence.	
24	THE COURT: So the defense rests?	
٥٢	MD COMPINED. V Toda-	

MR. GOMBINER: Yes, Judge.

HCK8THOS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Let me hear from the government. Walk me through what you rely on from the detective and what you rely on from the e-mails.

MR. WARREN: Yes, your Honor. This is, of course, my mistake. That's the only copy I brought of those exhibits.

THE COURT: I will lend them back to you, but go ahead.

MR. WARREN: Thank you, your Honor.

So, your Honor, Exhibit B is the order itself, which I don't think that's in dispute at all.

Exhibit C is the detective's report. And in the detective's report there is --

THE COURT: Detective Rivera?

MR. WARREN: Yes, your Honor. And this is on page, the Bates stamp is USAO 360. And this is on the third numbered paragraph on that page of the detective's report of his interview with Mr. Thompson: "I asked Mr. Thompson if he has been in contact with the victim. He stated not since leaving NY. He states they filed reports against each other for harassment, but states that he does not engage in communication with her."

That's the first point on this detective's summary of that interview; the inference being that Mr. Thompson knew that there was an order of harassment that had been filed.

THE COURT: He knew there was a proceeding.

MR. WARREN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: He knew there was a proceeding commenced, maybe not the outcome based on that, but he knew there was a proceeding is the most I would infer from that.

Go ahead.

MR. WARREN: Then Exhibit E, your Honor, is an e-mail, and the top e-mail in this chain, this is the second page -- sorry, this is the first page of Exhibit E behind the actual exhibit. And the top e-mail is from Mr. Thompson. It says, "The hacker or hackers tweeted at my sister who told me about it. I then looked at the timeline, noticed they were engaged with someone who was very familiar with me, my friend below, that engaged that account, and this is what happened."

THE COURT: That's the end of the quote?

MR. WARREN: That is the end.

THE COURT: Let's have a clear record here. If you're starting a quote, tell me when you're starting it; if you are ending it, tell me when you're ending it.

Go ahead.

MR. WARREN: There is then a forwarded message. The forward is from veronicareeves6@gmail.com, on September 29, 2016, at 7:14 p.m. And it's to thompsonotherkin@gmail, Mr. Thompson's Gmail address.

This is a quote from the message that's forwarded:
"OK, Juan. You're a coward. I'm the guy who lives and loves,

Juan. Obviously you get your female bullying tactics from your father. Researching you has been quite a laugh."

THE COURT: Slow down. We have a court reporter who is trying very hard to take this all down.

MR. WARREN: Understood.

"You're a character. So how about this? You never contact, disparage, remark, e-mail, threaten, try to contact her again, at her work, home, through friends or relatives, using electronic means, phone (cell or landline), e-mail, text or in person, through your friends, relatives, or other persons, true or fake. If you comply, it will end here, except if you show up in the State of New York, whereas a warrant has been issued for your arrest for violation of an order of protection (aggravated harassment by electronic means). It's just another day at the office for me, Juan. This whole thing lies in your hands. Your future, Juan."

THE COURT: And this is from?

MR. WARREN: This is from an e-mail account that Mr. Thompson created and then sent to himself. That's the September 29, 2016, at 7:14 e-mail.

THE COURT: So it's an $e-mail\ from\ Mr.$ Thompson to Mr. Thompson.

MR. WARREN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Hand it up, please.

MR. WARREN: I am handing up Exhibit E to the Court.

THE COURT: I want the other exhibits back also. They have been received into evidence.

MR. WARREN: I am also handing up Exhibit C and Exhibit B.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Gombiner, anything else?

MR. GOMBINER: Well, Judge, first, with respect to this e-mail, that's the government's theory as to who sent this e-mail to whom. There is no evidence to support that other than the government's statement. This isn't an e-mail from Mr. Thompson. The government wants the Court to infer that he made this up and created it, but there is no evidence of that. So we would object to it on that basis.

But even if the government could prove that, the statement that "whereas a warrant has been issued --"

THE COURT: Wait a minute. You deny that from Juan Thompson at thompsonotherkin@gmail is not your client's --

MR. GOMBINER: No, I am not denying that. I am denying the e-mail in question is from veronicareeves6@gmail.

THE COURT: This is the problem you have, Mr.

Gombiner. The government says this was an e-mail that Mr.

Thompson wrote and sent it to Mr. Thompson. But if we generously assume that that's not true, that he didn't send it, that he didn't write it, if we generously assume that, still we have Mr. Thompson receiving the e-mail, which puts him on

notice of the order of protection.

MR. GOMBINER: Judge, I would say that is well beyond anything that could be reasonably taken away from this e-mail, whether Mr. Thompson received it or whether he wrote it himself. Because the only relevant portion of it says, "Whereas a warrant has been issued for your arrest for violation of an order," that is not true.

THE COURT: Read what it says. That's not what it says.

MR. GOMBINER: "Whereas a warrant has been issued --"

THE COURT: Excuse me a second, Mr. Gombiner. Don't interrupt me. That's not what it says. Please read what it says.

MR. GOMBINER: "Except if you show up" -- I am reading the relevant portion of it. I can read the whole thing.

THE COURT: What you specifically did in terms of the relevant portion, you omitted the words "of protection." That strikes me as rather relevant.

MR. GOMBINER: Judge, OK. Let me just read it over again.

The relevant portion reads: "Except if you show up in the State of New York, whereas a warrant has been issued for your arrest for violation of an order of protection (aggravated harassment by electronic means)."

I can keep reading. "It's just another day at the

office for me, Juan. This whole things lies in your hands. Your future, Juan."

So the points I was trying to make is, one, there was no warrant that had been issued for his arrest. In fact, the New York City detective who came two months later didn't have a warrant for Mr. Thompson's arrest. So that is simply not accurate.

"An order of protection (aggravated harassment by electronic means)," that does not show knowledge of the specific order of protection that was issued. The order of protection issued against Mr. Thompson was not simply an order of protection about aggravated —— I am not even sure what that means, "aggravated harassment by electronic means," but this does not suffice to show that Mr. Thompson had actual notice that an order of protection had been given.

There is no case in New York law, I am 100 percent confident, that anything remotely close to this has ever been held to constitute actual notice. The idea that maybe somebody had obtained some kind of an order is not enough to prove — even if you could infer that from this, and I would suggest that you can't, but even if you could, that wouldn't be enough to prove you had actual notice of the specific order at issue. There is no crime in New York for just violating an order of protection in general; you have to violate a specific order of protection.

THE COURT: But the guideline does not require that there be a finding by any court in the State of New York that you violated an order of protection.

MR. GOMBINER: The guideline does require it. The guideline requires that you have violated an order of protection.

THE COURT: Listen to what I said. The guideline does not require that any New York court have found that you violated an order of protection. You disagree with that statement?

MR. GOMBINER: I certainly don't disagree with it, in that the guideline doesn't have New York in it. But the guideline does say that it applies to someone who has violated an order of protection.

THE COURT: Correct.

MR. GOMBINER: The only order of protection we have here is a New York court order of protection. So to have violated a New York court order of protection, you would have had to do something that constituted a violation of a New York order of protection. And in New York you haven't violated an order of protection unless you have first received actual notice of it. So that is why it is important what New York courts have construed actual notice to be.

THE COURT: Where is your case law? The government has come forward and has cited McCormick v. Axelrod and People

v. Jakubowski. Where is the case law that you have to have the actual order? Do you have any such case?

MR. GOMBINER: I do have some cases. The cases that we cited -- McCormick, Tumminello, People v. Carthew -- they are in our letter. But in other cases, those are cases where, when there was actual notice, actual notice was either being in the court when the order was issued or having received a facsimile copy in another state, or maybe your lawyer was given a copy of the order. It's something where you could find that the defendant actually knew what the specific order against him was. There is no case, for example, where a neighbor said, Hey, Joe, I heard that your wife got an order of protection against you, and a court found that something like that was actual notice.

That's basically what the government has got here.

That is just not enough. New York courts, whether for good or for bad, take the concept of actual notice seriously. They don't mean it's just any rumor that there is an order of protection out there. They mean there is something specific where the court can find that the defendant knew about the particular order of protection that a particular court had issued against him or her. And this doesn't suffice. So we don't think that this is good enough to constitute actual notice.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I find by a preponderance of the evidence that Juan Thompson knew of the existence of an order of protection issued by a New York court and thereafter violated the order of protection; and, accordingly, the enhancement under 2A6.1(b)(3) is appropriate.

I begin with the telephone interview of Mr. Thompson on November 3, 2016 by a New York City police detective by the name of Rivera, part of the special investigations division, in which he asked if Mr. Thompson had been in contact with the victim and he stated, "Not since leaving New York. He states that they filed reports against each other for harassment, but states he does not engage in communication with her." This reflects knowledge on his part of judicial proceedings in New York; that's a reasonable inference to be drawn from the exhibit. It does not, however, reference an order of protection.

There is, in addition to that, the September 29, 2016 e-mail from Veronica Reeves to Juan Thompson. While the government contends that Mr. Thompson was the author and the recipient of the e-mail of September 29, 2016, there is no serious dispute that he at least received the e-mail.

The government's theory of the case is that this was an attempt again to build a false record, but, nevertheless, it was received by Mr. Thompson and it says, "Except if you show up in the State of New York." It says -- I will back it up.

It says, in essence, that "you never contact, disparage, remark, e-mail, threaten, try to contact her again, at her work, home, through friends or relatives, using electronic means, phone (cell or landline), e-mail, text or in person, through your friends, relatives or other persons to her face. If you comply, it will end here." This is the relevant language that proceeds after that: "Except if you show up in the State of New York, whereas a warrant has been issued for your arrest for violation of an order of protection (aggravated harassment by electronic means)." And then it says, "It's just another day at the office for me, Juan. The whole thing lies in your hands. Your future, Juan."

I find by a preponderance of the evidence that Mr. Thompson was on notice of the issuance of an order of protection by the New York courts at least as of September 29, 2016. And to the extent he didn't know the words of the order, that would simply be because of conscious avoidance, which is the equivalence of knowledge. When one consciously avoids learning facts, the consequence of said avoidance is the same as if one has actual notice knowledge.

So that's my finding. I find the enhancement is appropriate.

Any other objections to the guideline calculation, Mr. Gombiner?

MR. GOMBINER: No, Judge. Just to complete any

record --

THE COURT: Wait a minute. I gave you a full and fair opportunity to say anything else you have to say. If you want to disagree with my ruling, there is place you can go for the disagreement. I asked you if you had any other evidence, you wanted to make any other argument. If your purpose now is to make a comment on my ruling, the time has come and passed for that.

MR. GOMBINER: The only comment I was going to make was --

THE COURT: Is it about the ruling?

MR. GOMBINER: -- addressed to an issue that the government did not raise. Nobody had suggested before the idea of conscious avoidance is a way you can violate an order of protection.

THE COURT: Well, that's great. Why don't you take that up on appeal. That's an alternate finding I made. It's clear you disagree with the finding. I don't ask you to agree with it, but we have now been on this issue for quite some time and we have other business to attend to.

MR. GOMBINER: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Do you have any other objections to the quideline calculation in this case?

MR. GOMBINER: No, we don't.

THE COURT: Does the government have any objections to

the guideline calculation in this case?

MR. WARREN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I find that the guidelines are correctly calculated and the defendant is at total offense level 21, Criminal History Category I, and the proper guideline range of imprisonment is 37 to 46 months' imprisonment.

I will now give Mr. Gombiner an opportunity to speak on behalf of the defendant.

MR. GOMBINER: Thank you, Judge.

The major point I would like to make here is that Mr. Thompson is extremely remorseful for what he did here. What he did here was horrible, and he knows it. He knows what he did caused extreme pain, not only to Ms. Rossi, most of all to her, but also to her coworkers, to her family, and to the people who ran the Jewish community centers. There is no excuse for his conduct. He accepts responsibility for it. He pled guilty to it and he knows that he has to be punished for it. So I just want to make that absolutely clear at the outset. Nobody is trying to justify what he did or say that there was anything good about it. It obviously had a very bad, not surprisingly, bad impact on the people who were the victims of his conduct. We accept that.

The Court has found that the guideline range is 37 to 46 months. The government in its sentencing letter says a sentence within that guideline range would constitute a just

punishment. We thought a lower guideline range should apply, but in our sentencing letter we also asked for a sentence within the guideline range, although at the low end of it.

So, really, the question for the Court is not, does
Juan Thompson deserve to be punished, because obviously he
does. The question is, what degree of punishment is warranted?
And there are two principal factors I would ask the Court to
look at in determining what an appropriate sentence is. The
first is what led Juan Thompson to commit this conduct. Maybe
there are three things. First, why did he do this? Who is
Juan Thompson? And going forward, what is his future going to
be?

Why did he do this? I think it was a combination of mental illness and alcohol abuse, and maybe, with an overlay of just generally dealing with the trauma and the very difficult upbringing he came from, trying to resolve that with how far he had gotten from that point, and obviously something happened here that he couldn't -- not that he couldn't resolve it, but that led him to do what he did.

Mr. Thompson had a very difficult childhood, and from a very early age has had some problems with mental illness. At the age of 14, he was being prescribed medication. He was having panic attacks. He sought mental health treatment while in college and after college. So he has definitely had some history of mental illness. We submitted a psychological

report, I forget the doctor's name.

THE COURT: Yes, I have read it. Dr. Rodriguez, is it?

MR. GOMBINER: Fernandez.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. GOMBINER: Who does find that — he did find that Mr. Thompson does have a history of mental illness. He doesn't think that Mr. Thompson is, like, critically mentally ill, but — obviously, he is not schizophrenic or anything like that. So there are degrees of mental illness, obviously, but that he does have some serious mental health problems.

The other, I think, precipitating factor for this, and probably the more direct factor, is the very serious issue of alcohol abuse, which, unfortunately, Mr. Thompson didn't really recognize in himself, because I think he saw alcohol as kind of a way of getting in touch with his emotions, but he was drinking very excessively during the time this conduct was going on, and I think that certainly contributed to the kind of things he was doing.

I think Dr. Fernandez found that that combination leads to impulsive — impulsive not in the sense — obviously, these things took a certain degree of thought and planning in one sense, but impulsive in the sense that he wasn't really fully in control of thinking, like, what does this mean to be doing this kind of stuff? So I think that contributed to it.

Now, there is no question that Mr. Thompson is a very unusual individual. There aren't too many people who grow up in the slums of St. Louis who end up getting admitted to Vassar College. But not just getting admitted. We submitted a number of letters from his professors there, and it's clear that Mr. Thompson was an excellent and admired student. He did many things. He was a good student. He was a leader. He contributed to the community. The kind of letters we submitted, these weren't just stock letters, these were letters that detailed many of his accomplishments, and that is a somewhat remarkable thing.

So Mr. Thompson definitely has some strengths; not just strengths but — unique would not be the right word, because that would be one of a kind, and I am not suggesting Mr. Thompson is one of a kind, but he certainly is in a very small percentage of people who are able to come from a background of poverty and abuse and neglect and succeed at a very elite, privileged institution like Vassar College. So I think that is something that is worthy of the Court's consideration.

I also think it's worthy of the Court's consideration at a completely different level. Since he has been in prison, Mr. Thompson has been working at the food service unit at the Metropolitan Detention Center, and he is getting very good reviews there. He has been a hard worker. The people who are

supervising like him. So he is clearly able to shift gears and do well in that kind of an environment as well. So he does have some definite strengths.

So I think those are factors the Court should take into consideration. Probably the ultimate issue I think here is, well, what is going to happen in the future? Because, obviously, the Court would and probably should have concerns over, well, is Mr. Thompson going to be doing something like this again? Does he pose a danger to the community once he gets out? And I don't want to say there is no risk, because that would be disingenuous, but what I think could work here and will work here is — I think definitely a degree of punishment is warranted. I am not putting that aside. This isn't just about Mr. Thompson because there are victims here as well.

So I think a guideline sentence probably is warranted here, but I think it needs to be followed by -- once he gets out, there definitely needs to be conditions of supervised release that require intensive both mental health treatment and substance abuse treatment. And that's what Dr. Fernandez recommended. He thought that would go a long way towards mitigating any future risk.

This is a case, I think Mr. Thompson is the kind of person that, if he is able to deal with those issues, he really can be a successful person in the world. He definitely has the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

capacity to do things that very few defendants who appear before the Court have those kinds of abilities. We just don't see that very often, and putting aside state court, you don't see it very often in federal court either, even with people who maybe have had a lot more opportunities earlier on in life.

Mr. Thompson has managed to achieve a great deal. Не has also done harm here, and I understand that's why we are This is not trying to get him a reward or anything. I do want to make clear that he is somebody who can, going forward, do something really positive with his life. All he can say now about what happened is that he is tremendously ashamed and remorseful for what he did. I mean, he knows the harm and pain it caused people and he is in jail right now, sitting here chained at his ankles. This has already been a hard situation for him, and it's going to continue to be hard for a while, but I think it sends -- the Court now has found that the guideline range is 37 to 46 months, so accepting -- we have objected so I will move on from that, but accepting that as the range, we think a sentence at the low end of the quideline range would be an appropriate balance of all the factors under Section 3553(a), and we would ask the Court to impose such a sentence.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Gombiner.

MR. GOMBINER: Can we approach the sidebar just for one minute with the government?

SPECTATOR: May I object? THE COURT: You may object. Let me find out what it is and then I will decide the appropriate way to go. (Continued on next page) (Pages 27-30 sealed by order of the court)

(In open court)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, the sidebar, which I think about 50 percent of it related to what I would now say and the other 50 percent is what information I got, related to an ongoing investigation and Mr. Thompson's role in possibly being able to assist or having assisted in some aspect of that. And the nature of that circumstance is far removed from the conduct in issue in this case factually, and I need not say anything further, and I have ordered that portion of the transcript sealed.

Mr. Thompson, this is your opportunity to speak, to address the Court directly, to bring to my attention any facts or circumstances that you believe I should take account of in passing sentence upon you today. If there is anything you wish to say, this is the time to say it.

THE DEFENDANT: May I stand?

THE COURT: You may stand.

THE DEFENDANT: I just wish to say that I wish my family were here. Also, part of me doesn't wish that they were here. I came from working-class people and the holidays are around the corner and my 17-year-old sister is starting college. I wouldn't dare ask that any of them, given all I have asked of them so far. Even though they are not here in the physical realm, I know they are here in the spiritual and send their love, and for that I am grateful.

I also wish to apologize to Ms. Rossi. I know the pain and the embarrassment that she suffered is the result of my decisions, the actions that I have made.

Being incarcerated in this entire experience has taught me there are some unpleasant truths about myself that I haven't come to grips with yet, and that I have to an extent now that I have been incarcerated. And given the scope of things and what is happening around the country, I know there are still strands of misogyny and bigotry within me that I am committed to battling and to licking once and for all.

I also wish to apologize to the Jewish community centers for the suffering that they have experienced. To know that people who I admired and respected for their resilience have been hurt by my own decisions and choices has been heartbreaking on multiple fronts. There are wounds that are there that will probably never heal. Not only did I not heal those wounds or help them, I added salt to those wounds and made it worse. Ultimately, to all those who were harmed by my choices, by the things that I did, I offer my heartfelt apologies. I do not seek absolution, but I do seek forgiveness.

The only promise that I can make to this Court is that such a hideous thing on my part will never happen again. I do realize that it's important to take care of one's mental health. I do realize how important knowledge and consciousness

is and you have to take everything that happens as a slight or micro-aggression or anything along those lines. If I am truly committed to the idea of a more humane society, then it starts with me, and I screwed up royally in this instance and I apologize deeply.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

This is the government's opportunity to speak.

MR. WARREN: First, I would just like to note that Ms. Rossi is here, and she has a lot of friends and family here to support her. She would like to address the Court, and I know we have been going on for a long time, but I think she has about ten minutes worth of prepared remarks that she would like to address to the Court.

The conduct here is just devastating. If you read the victim impact statements, it's awful, it's horrific. What she went through is terrible. She is an incredibly strong person to have endured it; not only everything that happened was bad, to have the tables turned against her so that she was the one being investigated by law enforcement through these false claims. It wasn't just her, it was her friends, her family members, her employer, who suffered through this.

The victim impact letters, the ones from her parents, there is no worse feeling than seeing your child suffer and knowing there is nothing you can do about it. Someone described it as, watching Ms. Rossi go through it and going

through it themselves is a living nightmare. As Ms. Rossi said in her letter to the Court, she lost a year of her life over this. And it wasn't just Ms. Rossi and her friends and her family members and her employer, it was her entire community also, the victim organizations.

While there is no evidence in the record that Mr.

Thompson ever planned on or took any steps to carry out these threats, they all have to act, when they receive a bomb threat like this, as if it would be carried out. So dogs have to be called in, first-responder resources have to be diverted there. And as pointed out in the government's sentencing submission, those organizations effectively shut down for a period of time until the threat is neutralized. And when these threats were made, there was, of course, this atmosphere of fear, these threats all across the country, and the defendant's conduct here perpetuated that.

So for those reasons, the reasons in the victim impact letters, the reasons in the government's sentencing submission, we do think a guideline sentence of incarceration is appropriate here, and we also recommend a period of supervised release and special conditions that the probation department recommended.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Rossi, you may come forward, if you'd like, and if it would be convenient, you may stand at the podium.

1 State your full name. MS. ROSSI: Francesca Rossi. 2 3 THE COURT: That's R-O-S-S-I? 4 MS. ROSSI: Yes. 5 THE COURT: Please proceed. MS. ROSSI: Thank you, your Honor. 6 7 I stand in front of you today grateful to be alive. Men like Juan Thompson usually end up murdering their victims. 8 9 He stalked, harassed and threatened me with such insidious 10 methods, I feared for my life every day. Despite being present 11 today at sentencing, I am still not convinced that he won't try 12 to kill me. 13 We are here today because Juan Thompson threatened 12 14 Jewish community centers, in my name, as a part of his abusive 15 tactics aimed at destroying my life. We are here because domestic terrorism is rooted in violence against women. 16 17 Now think to yourself, how many times during the day does your phone vibrate, with an alert about an e-mail, a text, 18 a post, a status update, a phone call? Imagine each time you 19 20 receive these alerts your mind goes blank, your body becomes 21 paralyzed in fear and you can't breathe, because each of these 22 alerts is caused by a person threatening to harm you and 23 everyone that you know. 24 When I met Juan Thompson, I thought I had met the

He was charming, intelligent, handsome -- he was

25

perfect man.

a passionate journalist who said he could change the world through his words. He said all the right things. We fell in love over dinners and deep conversations about social justice.

After a year together, things started to fall apart and the real Juan emerged. He was accused of plagiarism and falsifying sources by his employer and was immediately fired. His public persona and career were ruined in an instant. I assumed the role of supportive partner and stood by his side, believing his cover story and dismissing the accusations of fraud. He had an excuse for everything, and I believed him.

Still, a seed of doubt began to grow in my mind.

Although the media coverage of my story has reported that

Juan's abuse began when I ended our partnership, the reality is

that Juan was actively abusing me while we were in a

relationship and living together. His pattern of impersonating

sources and defrauding people wasn't limited to his work. He

spent the entirety of our relationship using those same tactics

to isolate, shame and abuse me.

Juan's campaign was methodical and extensive. While we were living together, I spent months believing that ex-boyfriends were stalking and threatening me. I received an onslaught of e-mails, phone calls and texts with horrible false accusations about me. A nude picture of me was found on Facebook, posted by an impersonated ex-boyfriend's profile picture. I received a lawsuit, supposedly filed by an ex's

wife, falsely alleging that I had spread an STI to her husband and therefore to her. I didn't know --

THE COURT: STI?

MS. ROSSI: Sexually transmitted infection.

I didn't know it was fake until we found that the lawyer who had purportedly filed it had been impersonated. During this time, I sought support from Juan, unaware that he was directing and inflicting the emotional turmoil I was experiencing. He constantly compared himself to these men and harped on their supposed transgressions. I started to feel paranoid, not understanding why so many of my exes were stalking me and trying to hurt me.

When I retained a lawyer to pursue a case against the ex-boyfriend, who had supposedly posted revenge porn, she asked me a sobering question: Are you certain this wasn't actually done by your current boyfriend? I was shocked at the possibility, and to learn that New York State does not have a revenge porn law. You'd be surprised, she explained, the majority of people who experience this type of manipulation are actually being stalked by their current partner.

She was right. The man I trusted and shared my home with was actively trying to destroy me. It's hard to explain how I felt when I realized that all of the harassment I had endured was actually perpetrated by the man that I was in love with. My prior months of torment flashed before me as I

realized that Juan was behind all of it, receiving vicarious pleasure through my psychological pain.

THE COURT: Approximately when did you come to that realization?

MS. ROSSI: In July of 2016.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. ROSSI: I felt like my insides were being ripped apart as my mind shut down from its attempts to process the horrific reality.

I had no idea this was the beginning of the nightmare. The shock never really wore off, but the terror set in. And I have lived in fear for my life every day since.

I ended my relationship with Juan as soon as my lawyer confirmed he had authored the fake lawsuit. He refused to believe it was over and would not leave my apartment. I wanted him out of my life and I believed that breaking up would end this torment. Juan only escalated.

Every day for the next nine months, the life I had loved and had worked so hard to build became unrecognizable. My joy and my passion was taken from me. I felt no emotion other than fear and dread about what would happen next.

Juan went after me where he thought he would hurt me the most. I have dedicated 15 years of my life to my career as a social worker. I work with vulnerable clients and they trust me with their lives. I am passionate about the work I do with

and for them. Juan knew this. When he lost direct access to me, he began to attack me in my professional world.

The day after I broke up with Juan, he tried to get me fired. He repeatedly contacted my agency's senior management team while posing as multiple journalists and claimed to be investigating me for various professional and ethical infractions. He said I had been pulled over for drunk driving; he said I was being investigated for spreading an STI to numerous partners; he said I bought drugs from my clients — all of which I could have been fired for, none of which were true. Because I had already informed my employer of the situation, they were on alert for suspicious e-mails and phones calls. They refused to engage with Juan's fake personas, which only further antagonized him.

He began harassing my supervisors, our board of directors, my coworkers and employees for the next nine months. Through the personas he invented, he attempted to extort tens of thousands of dollars from the agency. He sent pictures of guns to human resources alleging that they were mine, and that I was the one threatening him. He accused me of being anti-Semitic and racist. He sent faxes, e-mails, postings, made-up articles, and phone calls in attempts to get me to lose my job. And it didn't stop there. Juan made similar accusations to the professional social work board I am licensed under. It resulted in an investigation which could have

jeopardized my entire career.

On top of managing the intensity of my workload, I had to learn how to cope with receiving threatening e-mails in my work inbox all day, every day. In between stabilizing my clients' emotional crises, I struggled to keep from drowning myself, as I received e-mails from Juan with pictures of me, allegedly linked to sex tapes he threatened to expose, which made me fear he had secretly recorded me. While sitting at my desk, I would receive e-mails with subject lines, such as "this bullet's for you slut," or, "your life will be destroyed." He sent me my family's home addresses and told me they were next. When my boss would call me, I didn't know if it was work related or because they were calling me about another threat against me from Juan.

Every day I go to work knowing that my bosses and my coworkers know personal and private things about my life, and have seen images that I didn't invite them into. This humiliation cannot be undone.

What I was experiencing was intimate partner violence, at work and in my personal life. It is petrifying because the person you love becomes the person you fear. I had no respite from his torment. Every single day Juan texted, called and e-mailed me relentlessly. Sometimes he would pose as a friend or a family member of his, like his mom or an imaginary best friend, claiming Juan loved me and Juan never meant me harm.

Sometimes he would pose as a person trying to extort me and demand payment or else naked pictures and videos of me would be posted all over the Internet. Sometimes he would pose as strangers, threatening to end my life. And sometimes he would call as himself claiming he had been framed. And when I didn't respond, his cycle would start again — apology, extortion, threat, denial.

I could not think about anything else. I felt like a shell of a person, watching myself shrink deeper into the psychological torture I was experiencing.

When he didn't get a response from me, he took to any media outlet he could get to listen and defame me publicly. He even went as far as faking his own near death. He e-mailed news outlets inflammatory fake stories about me. He made Tumblr pages about me and any man I had dated, complete with pictures and references to STIs. He filmed videos on YouTube about me, and then posted videos of himself commenting on the grotesque stories he had developed. He did these things as himself, as fake personas he invented, complete with pictures and profiles, and as people he impersonated. Technology gave him an omnipresence over my life. Beyond phone calls, e-mails and texts, he used every digital platform imaginable to harass me -- Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, OkCupid, Tumblr, YouTube, Venmo, and Google. Every time my phone buzzed, I panicked.

When I thought it couldn't get worse, he doxed me on

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8chan, a Web site known for hosting child pornography and where men promote violence against women, including rape and murder. He posted my picture, home and work addresses and phone numbers, urging the Web site users to target me. He crowd-sourced his attacks on me. I felt like the walls were closing in. Everywhere I turned, Juan was there, waiting to destroy my life, my career, my relationships, and probably kill me.

While coping with the fear and trauma that I was personally dealing with on a daily basis, I received calls, texts and e-mails from my family and friends who Juan had also targeted with his methods. I was left to worry about how I could manage going to work every day, while also dealing with the reality of my life. Also, while managing the fact that Juan's terror was spreading to so many people around me, and at times their workplaces and their extended families. know of, Juan went after at least 47 people in my life. Sometimes it was someone as close to me as my 92-year-old grandmother, calling me afraid for her safety and mine. Or my mother, receiving e-mails of a photo of my face, with a gun sight target superimposed in it demanding payment. People distantly linked to me were receiving e-mails about me from Juan or someone that Juan was impersonating. He stalked other people as me, and to this day I will never know how many people he did that with. Each time I learned Juan had abused someone

else, I was triggered and reminded of my own trauma and was worried about their safety as well as my own. Based on the escalation of e-mail threats I had been receiving, I was constantly fearful that my family, my friends, my employer, and my clients were in as much danger as I was.

He tried to take away from everything and everyone that was important to me. Separation and isolation are central aspects of intimate partner violence and acted as the foundation for Juan's campaign. Most people didn't understand what I was going through and distanced themselves from me; others were becoming victims and getting fatigued by the vicarious, secondary and direct trauma themselves. Sympathetic loved ones would continually ask me, Why hasn't he been arrested yet?, not understanding that these obvious crimes were not being legally distinguished as domestic violence. Everyone watched as Juan's abuse escalated and my life grew more terrifying.

The reality is that I asked for help from law enforcement over 20 times. I asked for restraining orders to stop him. I was told by the police, verbatim, "It will get worse and then we can try to help." Because he was using the Internet as his method of violence, the police did not recognize the severity of harm. They couldn't or wouldn't do the investigative work because Juan was masking his identity through anonymizing e-mail accounts, VPNS, and the TOR browser,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

making his threats, in their minds, untraceable. I watched him escalate every day. Yet the police were very responsive to Juan, believing his false accusations when they came to investigate me, and not him.

Five months before Juan's arrest, he sent a threat to a Brooklyn police station, stating I was planning to quote "shoot up" the precinct. The NYPD intelligence division tracked me down in the middle of my workday to assess the validity of such a threat. They left assured that I was not the one who had made the threat, but they could not verify and locate the person who had, despite me telling them that it was undoubtedly Juan Thompson. Two weeks later he e-mailed a news station with a death threat against me and the chief of police. This truly solidified my fear that Juan was trying to kill me. Soon after, the NYPD firearms division showed up at my apartment to investigate me for selling guns. If the police had believed that I was planning a violent attack on a New York City police station with my arsenal of alleged guns, I could have been seriously harmed, or worse. I know that was Juan's goal. He was now using them as a weapon against me.

Each time I came into contact with the police, I was fearful of what would happen, due to Juan's continued escalation of violence framing me to law enforcement agencies. I felt paralyzed, hopeless and powerless, every moment of my life. Even so, I had no other recourse and I continued to ask

them for help; each time I told the officers that I knew my abuser's name and I believed it was going to get worse. When the FBI showed up at my apartment because Juan had used my name to threaten a Jewish community center in San Diego, I was petrified and enraged. I handed the FBI a 31-page timeline chronicling each threat Juan had made against me and all the people in my life. The FBI said to me, he's escalating. I had been experiencing this level of abuse for nine months. Four days later, Juan was arrested for making eight threats against Jewish community centers, while pretending to be me. I have learned from the media that it was actually 12 centers.

Juan devoted over an entire year to destroying my life. He painted me as an anti-Semite, a racist, a drunk, a slut, a drug dealer, a child pornographer, and a gun runner. He did everything he could to instill terror in my life. Computers, phones, and tablets all became an apparatus for his abuse. The police confiscated 25 electronic devices from Juan when he was arrested. I will never know the full extent of his harassment, the content he disseminated, and whatever else he may have done in my name. I do know that as a result of him pretending to be me and stalking others, he has ended marriages, targeted families, damaged relationships, threatened the police, and engaged in domestic terrorism against Jewish communities nationwide. He struck fear into the heart of the Jewish community in his vendetta against me. These hoax

threats were not victimless pranks -- they altered the course of hundreds of people's lives, and we still don't know if Juan wouldn't have carried out his threats.

The abuse and victimization that I was subjected to is not unusual. Intimate partner violence needs more legal attention, given that 93 percent of female homicides are committed by a man the victim knows. We know that in the past year, each man who has committed domestic terrorism has a history of domestic violence. These charges of cyberstalking and hoax threats Juan pled guilty to are inextricably linked. If the police had recognized the stalking and abuse as domestic violence when I had reported it, many times, hundreds of people's lives would be different.

Today I speak to you as Francesca Rossi, not
"Victim-1." There is no way here I can articulate the pain I
felt daily as Juan threatened my entire existence. I am here
because I have the resources and strong support, but the
long-range effects of this trauma are undeniable. Part of me
thinks that Juan is probably taking pleasure in hearing the
pain he caused me right now. He always had a voyeuristic
enjoyment in my suffering. Why else would he have anonymously
terrorized me while we slept in the same bed? I am here
because I need everyone to know the destruction that Juan is
capable of, and that digital technology should be recognized as
a powerful weapon to inflict violence. Countless people are

subjected to the same type and degree of stalking and abuse that Juan inflicted on me, and worse.

This is not an Internet crime. Technology may have facilitated it, but all of this occurred in real life. The police diminished my abuse because my life-threatening attacks came from phones and computers. This is what domestic violence looks like now.

My abuse was not legitimized until an entire community, and the country was terrorized. Juan used modern technology to exploit antiquated laws. However, we can prevent this from happening to other women. Let my story shape the way we recognize the modern behaviors of attack and the weapons that are used. Let us believe women when they tell us of their abuse, because the men that inflict it only get worse. I urge you to not let there be a next time, don't let Juan do this to another woman, another community, or the country.

Juan's pathology and misogyny will still exist when he comes out. Each time we see an act of domestic terrorism, we root it back to violence against women. Every time. And I don't trust he won't do this again. I know there are other Juans out there doing this to other women right now. We have the power to stop them, starting right now, by holding Juan Thompson fully accountable for his crimes.

Thank you so much for letting me speak.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Rossi.

This is the Court's statement of reasons for what I will describe as my proposed sentence in this case.

In sentencing the defendant, I have considered all of the materials referenced at the outset. I have considered all of the arguments that the defendant raised in his written submissions and, of course, orally today. I have considered the exceptionally thoughtful statements that have been made in this courtroom today by defense counsel and the prosecution, and perhaps one of the most eloquent presentations I have heard in this courtroom from Ms. Rossi.

I have considered each of the factors under Section 3553(a). I need not recount all that I have considered, but I have considered each of the factors. I will comment on some of it.

There are two crimes to which Juan Thompson has pled guilty. One is a charge of cyberstalking, which arises from circulating false and threatening information about Ms. Rossi over the Internet, causing substantial emotional distress, and this was from July 2016 to March 2017. But then there is Count Two, a separate charge. And that is, from January 2017 through March 2017, Mr. Thompson conveyed at least 12 threats in either his own name or in the victim's name, Ms. Rossi's name, to bomb or commit acts of violence against Jewish community centers, schools or organizations that provide services to and on behalf of the Jewish community. Each of these crimes in their own

right is extremely serious.

Because of the presentations that have been made today, I had planned to go through the facts set forth in the presentence report. I do not believe I could do them justice to any extent greater than what was heard from Ms. Rossi today. Suffice it to say that some of the comments that were made and some of the threats in an e-mail to a Jewish school, in Farmington Hills, Michigan, the claim in the message was that he was eager for a Jewish Newtown, a reference obviously to the horrific shooting in Newtown, Connecticut in December 2012, in which 20 victims were murdered.

Some of his threats to Jewish organizations were made and required deviation of resources.

So on February 21, he sent an e-mail to the Council on America-Islamic Relations, claiming that Ms. Rossi had placed a bomb inside a Jewish center in Dallas, Texas. He also sent an e-mail to the Anti-Defamation League, which claimed that Ms. Rossi had made bomb threats against Jewish community center sites, and that she was planning on making more bomb threats. The following day, the Anti-Defamation League received an anonymous call, which claimed that explosive materials had been planted in their office and were to be detonated within the next hour. Emergency services were immediately contacted after the telephone call.

This is domestic terrorism. It's domestic terrorism

in the literal sense, in that Mr. Thompson's actions were designed to create substantial fear and distress in Ms. Rossi; and, also separately, because he was motivated by the desire to injure Ms. Rossi, they created terror and fear in the minds of persons working at these various Jewish community centers.

The thing to be remembered is, as a judge presiding in sentencings, I have people who have engaged in a crime which was the exercise of bad judgment at a particular point in their lives. That's not what we are dealing with here. There was no error in judgment. This was a sustained campaign against Ms. Rossi, which terrorized her and caused terror on the part of the people working for the institutions. Mr. Thompson is intelligent, well-educated, and he knew and appreciated the nature and consequences of his acts and why they were wrong.

Now, I have considered all of the letters that have been submitted, all of the submissions that have been made; particularly, there is one from Mr. Thompson's younger sister and several from folks who knew him at Vassar.

I have also considered Dr. Fernandez's report. He says that, based on the information provided in the evaluation, Mr. Thompson does not meet criteria for a severe mental illness. But he goes on to say, "It's important to note that he has endorsed" -- he, Mr. Thompson -- "has endorsed experiencing symptoms consistent with depression and anxiety." And, of course, Dr. Fernandez notes his severe alcohol abuse.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And he wonders if there is a possibility that he has a personality disorder, but doesn't have enough information to render a diagnosis.

I note that Dr. Fernandez says what Mr. Gombiner says, and I think Mr. Thompson says as well, that he has a desire to change and an intent to change, and I accept that at face value.

Mr. Thompson did not grow up in easy circumstances. He reports that his mother was a crack cocaine abuser, that his father died after what appeared to be a car chase with police, and that he was not really a positive force in Mr. Thompson's life. But Mr. Thompson's intelligence gave him the ability to obtain a degree in political science, bachelor's degree, from Vassar University in 2013. It really was his intelligence and creativity that made him such a horror to the people whose lives he terrorized. He used the gifts he had, he used the education he had, as weaponry against other people. He used his knowledge of social media and computers and a creative imagination to come up with some of the things that he came up with, including accusing Ms. Rossi of watching child pornography and various sexually transmitted diseases and the like. This required a lot of thought over a long period of time. This was no mistake.

Now, I have considered the need for just punishment. This case cries out for Mr. Thompson to be punished; that is

the just thing to have happen here. There is the need to specifically deter him to protect the public from further crimes of this defendant. For the moment there is, in my view, the risk that he would reoffend over the short-term. I hope that with a period of incarceration that may diminish. I don't know. I don't have a crystal ball. But I am certainly positive that there is a need here, a strong need, to deter others from engaging in conduct of this nature.

I have considered the sentencing guidelines, policy statements and official commentary of the United States

Sentencing Commission. I realize that I am not obligated to sentence within the guidelines and that I have variance discretion.

With regard to that variance discretion, the United States Sentencing Commission was kind enough to give me some statistics, I think it was about 18 months ago, about my own sentencing practices, and it seemed that in noncooperation situations, at the request of the defense, sometimes not objected to by the government, I gave below guideline sentences in about 28 percent of the cases that were before me. I rarely give sentences above the advisory guidelines, and the reason this is true is because the guidelines help me ensure that there are not unwarranted disparities among persons who are convicted of crimes of this type.

I am not a judge who takes the guidelines lightly. I

think they reflect a lot of wisdom. But here, the level of intent, the level of intensity, the maliciousness behind it, the fact that this man was well-educated and he took his intellectual abilities and his education and used them to not just torment Ms. Rossi, but to spread this terror to 12 institutions, warrants a sentence of 60 months' imprisonment, three years' supervised release, waiver of the fine, based on limited earning ability and limited assets, restitution in an amount to be determined within the next 90 days, and a special assessment of \$200.

It is my sincere view that the foregoing is sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve the purposes of Section 3553(a).

Does the defendant or his counsel have any objection to the Court's proposed sentence or the statement of reasons for that sentence?

I will hear you now, Mr. Gombiner.

MR. GOMBINER: Other than already stated, we don't have any legal objection.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Any objection on the part of the government?

MR. WARREN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Thompson, please stand and I will pronounce sentence.

Juan Thompson, it is the judgment of this Court that

you are hereby remanded to the custody of the United States

Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for 60 months, and that's to
run concurrently on Counts One and Two. Following release from
imprisonment, you shall be placed on supervised release with
the following terms and conditions:

You shall not commit another federal, state or local crime, nor unlawfully possess a controlled substance.

You must refrain from unlawful use of a controlled substance.

You must submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from imprisonment and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter as determined by the court.

You must cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by probation.

You must comply with the standard conditions of supervision 1 through 13.

You will participate in an outpatient treatment program approved by probation, which program may include testing to determine whether you have reverted to using drugs or alcohol. You must contribute to the costs of services rendered based on your ability to pay and the availability of third-party payments. The Court authorizes the release of available drug treatment evaluations and reports, including the presentence investigation report, to the substance abuse treatment provider.

Monitoring program administered by the probation office. You must provide the probation office advance notice of any computers, automated services or connected devices that will be used during the term of supervision and that can access the Internet. Probation is authorized to install any application, as necessary, to survey all activity on computers or connected devices owned or operated by you. You may be required to pay the cost of monitoring services at the monthly rate provided by probation. The rate and payment schedule are subject to periodic adjustments. Probation shall be notified by electronic transmission of impermissible suspicious activity or communications occurring on such computer or connected device consistent with the computer monitoring policy in effect.

As triggered by impermissible or suspicious activity, you must consent to and cooperate with unannounced examinations of any computer equipment owned or used by you. This examination shall include, but is not limited to, retrieval and copying of all data from the computer's connected devices, storage media, and any internal or external peripherals, and may involve removal of such equipment for the purpose of conducting a more thorough inspection.

You must participate in an outpatient mental health treatment program approved by probation. You must continue to take any prescribed medications unless otherwise instructed by

the health care provider. You must contribute to the costs of services rendered, based on your ability to pay and ability of third-party payments. The Court authorizes the release of available psychological and psychiatric evaluations and reports, including the PSR, to the health care provider.

You must submit your person, residence, place of business, vehicle, and any property, computers, electronic devices, electronic communication devices, and/or other media under your control to a search on the basis that the probation officer has reasonable suspicion that contraband or evidence of a violation of the conditions of your release may be found. This search must be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner. Failure to submit may be grounds for revocation. You shall inform any other residents that the premises may be subject to search pursuant to the condition.

You must not have contact with the victims in this case, including, specifically, Ms. Rossi or any member of her family or coworkers. This includes any physical, visual, written, or telephonic contact with such persons.

Additionally, you must not directly cause or encourage anyone else to have such contact with the foregoing victims. This applies to all victims in this case, including the various Jewish community centers and other organizations who are victims, the employers who are victims, friends and associates of Ms. Rossi who are victims, Ms. Rossi and her family and her

employers who are victims.

It is further ordered that you shall pay to the United States a special assessment of \$200, which shall be due immediately.

There will be restitution in a separate order within 90 days, and the terms of payment will be set forth in that proposed order.

I am going to require the government to submit that to me by January 30.

MR. WARREN: Understood, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. As I said, based on limited assets, limited earning ability, the fine is waived.

Mr. Thompson, you have the right to appeal the sentence I have imposed on you. If you cannot afford the cost of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal as a poor person. The time limits for filing a notice of appeal are brief and they are strictly enforced. If you request, the clerk of court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf immediately.

Do you understand all that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I make that request of the clerk of the court.

THE COURT: We will cause a notice of appeal to be filed on your behalf.

Mr. Gombiner, can you undertake the filing of the

```
1
      notice of appeal?
               MR. GOMBINER: Judge, yes, we will do that.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: So Mr. Gombiner is going to file the
 4
      notice of appeal on your behalf. Is that all right, Mr.
5
      Thompson?
6
               THE DEFENDANT: I have no choice. So, yes, it's all
 7
      right.
8
               THE COURT: I have a request from a member of the
9
            "I am writing to request access to any sentencing
10
     memoranda or other materials submitted, either by the
11
      prosecution or defense, including letters relating to Mr.
12
      Thompson's scheduled sentencing on December 20."
13
               Any objection from the government?
14
               MR. WARREN: Your Honor, we would just ask to have the
15
      opportunity to make redactions.
               THE COURT: On what? How about the text of your
16
17
      letter? Let's start there. Is there anything in the text of
18
      the letter as distinguished from the exhibits?
19
               MR. WARREN: Yes, your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: Where? Show me.
21
               MR. GOMBINER: Can we approach on this?
22
               THE COURT: No. Because I am going to ask you, Mr.
23
      Gombiner.
24
               So go ahead. Tell me where.
25
               MR. WARREN: Yes, your Honor. On page 11, your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Go ahead. Tell me where. 1 That relates to the matter that was 2 Oh, I see. Yes. 3 addressed at the sidebar. This would be the third and fourth 4 sentence of the first paragraph on page 11. Is that correct? 5 MR. WARREN: That's correct, your Honor. THE COURT: You have permission to redact that. I am 6 7 going to direct you to file the text of the letter by 3 p.m. today with those redactions. 8 9 Is there anything in the exhibits that you want to 10 redact? 11 MR. WARREN: Your Honor, on the police report, just 12 the opportunity to redact the officer's personal information. 13 That comes to mind right away. 14 THE COURT: Granted. 15 Mr. Gombiner, anything that you wish to redact in your sentencing submission? 16 17 MR. GOMBINER: Yes, Judge. At page 7, going on to 18 page 8. THE COURT: Just one second. 19 20 Yes, you can redact that paragraph at the bottom of page 7 on to page 8. Otherwise this should be filed on ECF by 21 22 3 p.m. today. 23 MR. GOMBINER: Judge, also, can we redact the 24 psychological evaluation?

THE COURT: Yes, you can redact that as well.

25

HCK8THOS Anything else from the government? MR. WARREN: No. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Anything else from the defendant? MR. GOMBINER: No, Judge. Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you all very much.